



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the eighteenth century was a good, probably for the masters, certainly for the slaves" (p. 52). This favorable status doubtless prevented its growth and perpetuity. Slaves never were very numerous in Pennsylvania. Although located further to the south, the number was several thousand less than either in New York or in New Jersey. This was due to the increasing objections to slavery on moral grounds among the Quakers and to the fact that the industrial life of the colony did not promote it. With the adoption of the gradual abolition act of 1780, the first act of its kind in America, there began a gradual upward progress toward freedom and equality, and the number of slaves diminished rapidly. In some respects, freedom did not work to the advantage of the negro, as a strong race prejudice developed among the whites against him, which manifested itself in many ways and materially retarded his social and economic improvement. While he was nominally granted by law equal civil rights, he did not always enjoy them in practice and political equality was withheld until 1870.

The prominent part played by the people of Pennsylvania in inaugurating the first abolition societies, their participation in the later movement against slavery, as well as their attitude toward the slave problems raised by the fugitive-slave question, are adequately presented. The author applies the terms "abolition" to the early period and "anti-slavery" to the later movement, contrary to the usual custom. He cites the legal names of the societies of these periods in support of the terminology he has adopted. Technically, this use is justifiable, although confusing and unusual, as the employment of the terms "abolition" and "abolitionist" in the period following 1830 was so universal as to be given general recognition.

The type and press work are a decided improvement over that of the earlier volumes of the series.

HERMAN V. AMES.

Political History of New York State during the Period of the Civil War. By SIDNEY DAVID BRUMMER, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. XXXIX., no. 2.] (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1911. Pp. 451.)

Ohio Politics during the Civil War Period. By GEORGE H. PORTER, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. XL., no. 2.] (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1911. Pp. 255.)

As the authors of both these books state that their subjects were suggested by Professor Dunning, it is to be presumed that they are the forerunners of a series of political histories of the several states destined to proceed from his seminary. It seems worth while, therefore, to speak of their general and common features before discussing them separately.

In workmanship both are excellent. The facts upon which they are based seem well ascertained, well grouped, and sufficient for the purposes in view. This is particularly noticeable because few, if any, historical monographs have been produced so dependent upon newspapers. Both authors acknowledge this dependence, and Mr. Brummer explains the conservative methods which he used in interpreting them (p. 6). It is gratifying to the modern historian to note how firm a structure may be raised of this material so often rejected by the builder. No less commendable is the handling, in both cases, of the intricate problem of the inclusion and exclusion of national politics. To the mind of the reviewer, exactly the proper balance has been struck between national and local interest.

The scope of both books is precisely that indicated in the titles, taken at the narrowest. That on Ohio does indeed come to 1867, while that on New York reaches only through the election of 1864. But both are strictly political, and are practically confined to politics growing out of the Civil War, almost disregarding standing local problems. There is no discussion of party machinery. Lobbies, caucuses, patronage, conventions, etc., are referred to but nowhere described. While it is realized that much may be taken for granted, and that useless duplication is one of the greatest curses of modern historical production, it still seems that a series justifying itself on the need for local study should explain local differences of political management. More emphatically it seems that such a series should attempt, in some degree at least, to root politics in the soil. It is not necessary to write a social and economic history in order to accomplish this, but to divorce politics entirely from conditions is not to write history for modern needs. Mr. Porter devotes four pages to the origins of Ohio's population, and this is the sole recognition of the foundation upon which politics are based. Moreover, the United States was not quite so undemocratic, so utterly at the mercy of political leaders, as it here seems to be. The fact that the books have value rests upon the knowledge which their readers will bring to them, and consequently their use will be by students of American history. To a European and to the average American they must be dry as dust.

A central idea in both books is Professor Dunning's favorite contention that the Republican party of to-day has no organic and little vital connection with the party that elected Lincoln in 1860. No one can candidly read them without acknowledging that this thesis has, on the whole, been maintained, though it seems somewhat over-insisted upon. The gradual development of a homogeneity and a purpose by the "Union" party has not been made sufficiently clear.

Mr. Brummer has the more interesting field, and the more difficult. That he is able to treat of the mazes of New York factional fights and leave clear impressions of certain general movements, is a tribute to his constructive skill. Particularly he shows the influence of the war in breaking down old factions and lessening the power of faction, and

the gradual evolution of groups held together by their views of war policy. Mr. Brummer is distinctly a "Unionist", and he does not seem quite fair to the greatest figure with whom he has to deal, Horatio Seymour. He brings out more clearly than ever before the reasons for Seymour's failure to grasp the helm of the Democratic party, and, by inference, the loss that party sustained in Douglas; but he fails to appreciate, at least sympathetically, Seymour's point of view. Thurlow Weed has never been better revealed, and the portrait gains by being sympathetic. Weed's subtle virtues, unlike Seymour's, evaporate under too severe criticism. The number of interesting men concerned with the politics of a single state is remarkable, and in general the descriptions of them are lively, and the estimates of their character, sound.

Mr. Porter is somewhat more judiciously minded than Mr. Brummer, or at least does not express his own opinions so freely. His statement at the beginning of his discussion of the Peace Democracy, that its leaders "continued to use argument when emotion was dominant" (p. 128), is not borne out by his subsequent account of their policies (pp. 189, 191, 225, etc.), and the quotations from their turgid speeches (pp. 157, 178). Yet his account of that movement as a whole is colorless in the better sense. In citing acts of Congress he should have referred to the *Statutes*, rather than to McPherson's *History of the Rebellion* (p. 105). William Allen should not be referred to as *Governor* in the Bibliographical Note (p. 255), and as *Senator* elsewhere (pp. 133, 229, etc.). A commendable feature, not found in Mr. Brummer's work, is the mapping of significant votes. In this way Mr. Porter has made plain the remarkable persistence of Ohio's political geography. Still scarcely enough is made of geography, and particularly of Ohio's contact with the slave-holding states. The Border-State convention is not mentioned. Of course, the chief personal interest centres in the career of Vandaligham, and the portion of the book dealing with him is undoubtedly the best. The account of Vandaligham, however, like that of all other leaders, is so purely objective that no concept of his character is given. It may be that the historian should present historic figures solely through their acts, but politics alone do not give a wide enough basis of fact to afford grounds for a just estimate. The discussion of negro suffrage with which the book closes is well done, and contains some new material.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

Robert E. Lee: Man and Soldier. By THOMAS NELSON PAGE.
(New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1911. Pp. xviii, 734.)

MR. PAGE wrote this life "in obedience to a feeling that as the son of a Confederate soldier, as a Southerner, as an American, he, as a writer, owes something . . . which he should endeavor to pay" (p. xv). He believes that: "The reputation of the South has suffered because we have allowed rhetoric to usurp the place of history" (xviii). His thesis is that Lee belongs to the first rank of captains though whether